

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAY L. OTTOLINI,,

No. C-11-0477 EMC

Plaintiff,

v.

BANK OF AMERICA, *et al.*,

Defendant.

**ORDER RE SUPPLEMENTAL
BRIEFING**

Defendants have filed a motion to dismiss which is currently set for hearing on May 4, 2011.

Having reviewed Defendants' motion, the Court hereby orders that the parties provide supplemental briefing on the issue of subject matter jurisdiction.

"In civil cases, subject matter jurisdiction is generally conferred upon federal district courts either through diversity jurisdiction, 28 U.S.C. § 1332, or federal question jurisdiction, 28 U.S.C. § 1331." *Peralta v. Hispanic Bus., Inc.*, 419 F.3d 1064, 1068 (9th Cir. 2005). In their notice of removal, Defendants initially argued that this Court has diversity jurisdiction. *See* Mot. of Removal ¶ 4. But, subsequently, in their motion to dismiss, Defendants admitted that diversity jurisdiction was actually lacking as both Mr. Ottolini and Defendant ReconTrust Company, NA are citizens of California. *See* Mot. at 1; *see also Hunter v. Philip Morris USA*, 582 F.3d 1039, 1044 (9th Cir. 2009) (explaining that there is diversity jurisdiction "only where there is complete diversity of citizenship," *i.e.*, "where the citizenship of each plaintiff is different from that of each defendant"). Defendants maintained, however, that this problem does not defeat subject matter jurisdiction because this Court still has federal question jurisdiction over the instant matter. More specifically,

1 Defendants argued that there is federal question jurisdiction because (1) one of the causes of action
2 identified on the caption page of the complaint refers to a tax code and because (2) the complaint
3 contains allegations that Defendants were required to comply with the federal Home Affordable
4 Modification Program (“HAMP”) program.

5 The Court has difficulty in seeing merit in Defendants’ first argument. The caption page of
6 the complaint refers to Revenue and Tax Code §§ 23304.1 and 23305A. These statutes arise from
7 state law – *i.e.*, the California Revenue and Tax Code – not federal law – *i.e.*, the Internal Revenue
8 Code. Moreover, although the caption page does refer to the above statutes, that is the sole
9 reference made to the statutes in the entire complaint. There are no substantive allegations related to
10 these statutes. Thus, ultimately, no causes of action appear to be pled pursuant to the statutes.

11 As for Defendants’ second argument, the Court finds it problematic. In the complaint, Mr.
12 Ottolini does make reference to B of A and/or BAC’s agreement with the federal government to
13 work diligently to modify loans and/or participate in the HAMP. See Compl. ¶¶ 28-33. But that in
14 and of itself does not make any of the claims asserted in the complaint a federal cause of action. And in
15 contrast to the cases cited by Defendants, in the case at hand, none of the claims as pled seems to be
16 predicated on an agreement between B of A/BAC and the federal government.¹ The negligence
17 claim, for example, does not appear to make any reference to an agreement with the federal
18 government. As for the fraud claim, it does refer to an agreement, but that appears to be an
19 agreement that B of A/BAC made with Mr. Ottolini, not with the federal government. *See* Compl. ¶
20 47 (alleging that “foreclosing defendants agreed to review Plaintiff’s application for modification”).

21 Finally, to the extent there is at least one federal claim asserted in the complaint in addition
22 to state claims, the Court notes that Defendants have asked for dismissal of the federal claim, in
23

24

25 ¹ In the cases cited by Defendants, the claim asserted by the plaintiff was clearly predicated
26 on an agreement between the lender and the federal government. The plaintiff was alleging that the
27 lender had breached the agreement with the federal government and was seeking relief as a
28 third-party beneficiary. *See Gallardo v. Wells Fargo Bank NA*, No. CV 10-01441 GAF (AJWx),
2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11906 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 26, 2010); *Nguyen v. Bac Home Loan Servs., LP*, No.
C-10-01712 RMW, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 105704 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 1, 2010); *Escobedo v.
Countrywide Home Loans, Inc.*, No. 09cv1557 BLM (BLM), 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 117017 (S.D.
Cal. Dec. 15, 2009).

1 which case, there is the issue of whether the Court should maintain supplemental jurisdiction over
2 any remaining state claims. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1337(c).

3 No later than April 20, 2011, the parties shall file and serve briefs addressing the Court's
4 concerns regarding subject matter jurisdiction. Each brief shall be no longer than 3 pages.

5
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.
7

8 Dated: April 6, 2011


10 EDWARD M. CHEN
11 United States Magistrate Judge
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAY L. OTTOLINI,,
Plaintiff,

No. C-11-0477 EMC

v.
BANK OF AMERICA, *et al.*,
Defendant.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the U.S. District Court, Northern District of California. On the below date, I served a true and correct copy of the attached, by placing said copy/copies in a postage-paid envelope addressed to the person(s) listed below, by depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail; or by placing said copy/copies into an inter-office delivery receptacle located in the Office of the Clerk.

Jay L. Ottolini
5381 Faught Road
Santa Rosa, CA 95403
707-953-9705
PRO SE

Dated: April 6, 2011

RICHARD W. WIEKING, CLERK

By: /s/ Leni Doyle
Leni Doyle
Deputy Clerk